there has been rampant corruption. We know it; many people come to us; everybody comes here; they want gas connections, they want gas dealership, etc. And people here say, go to the Oil Selection Board. But they come back and tell us of the rempant corruption; without passing any money, no dealership is given there. I think that the Oil Selection Board should be scrapped. In view of the various complaints received and the demand now made in the House, would the honourable Minister kindly revert back to the old system of dealership being awarded by the oil companies who know the system?

SHRI BRAHM DUTT: I have to submit that complaints of this nature were received in the past also. I have looked into the files for complaints of corruption, of taking money, and I have found from the records that there is no complaint. Even if the Minister himself makes the selection, if the industry has a selection committee, even then such complaints are bound to arise. We, therefore, thought, it is our thinking as at present, that this is the better way.

SHRI SURESH KALMADI: Will you, please at least consider the suggestion?

SHRI BRAHM DUTT: We always consider suggestions.

DR. H. P. SHARMA: I did not quite get the answer. If there are any complaints, are they referred to the Committee itself? How many complaints have you received so far and what action has been taken?

SHRI BRAHM DUTT: I do not have the exact number of complaints but I can tell you the nature of complaints. There are about eight or nine types of complaints received from those people who do not get their allotment. In some formalities have not been fulfilled. For each allotment there are ten to eleven applications. Naturally only one application can be selected for allotment and the rest are bound to be rejected. We are trying to avoid any scope for complaints.

**Merger of small and Competitive Companies**

*167. SHRI KAILASH PATI MISHRA:†
SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE:

Will the Minister of INDUSTRY be pleased to state:

(a) the names of public sector companies which suffered losses last year and, by how much in each case, and what were the performance targets fixed for each one of them for the current year;

(b) whether there is any proposal to merge small and mutually competitive companies into big holding compaines to improve performance and ensure non-interference from bureaucracy and giving them greater freedom for commercial results; if so, the steps taken in this egard so far; and

(c) the performance targets fixed for the above units for the current and the next year?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC ENTERPRISES IN THE MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY (PROF. K. K. TEWARY): (a) to (c) A statement is laid on the Table of the House.

---

†The question was actually asked on the floor of the House by Shri Kailash Pati Mishra.

**Statement**

*Names of Public Sector Companies which suffered losses in* 1985-86 *alongwith performance targets for* 1986-87

(Rs. in lakhs)

| Sl. No. | Name of the Enterprises | Actual net loss for 1985-86 | Performance target for 1986-87 Profit(+) Loss (—) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| | *Steel* | | |
| 1 | Mishra Dhatu Nigam Ltd. | —490 | —498 |
| 2 | The Indian Iron & Steel Co. Ltd. | —6099 | —3903 |
| | *Minerals & Matals* | | |
| 3 | Kudremukh Iron Ore Co. Ltd. | —2117 | —2191 |
| 4 | Bharat Aluminium Co. Ltd. | —7738 | —5298 |
| 5 | Bharat Gold Mines Ltd. | —419 | —1609 |
| 6 | Bharat Refaractories Ltd. | —395 | —861 |
| 7 | Hindustan Copper Ltd. | —2771 | —1861 |
| 8 | India Fibricks & Insulation Company Ltd. | —279 | —199 |
| 9 | Manganese Ore (India) Ltd. | —10 | —5 |
| | *Coal* | | |
| 10 | Bharat Coking Coal Ltd. | —13994 | —22202 |
| 11 | Central Coalfiedls Ltd. | —8325 | +799 |
| 12 | Eastern Coalfiels Ltd. | —6997 | —13912 |
| 13 | Western Coalfields Ltd. | —9905 | +1031 |
| | *Chemicals, Fertilizers & Pharmaceuticals* | | |
| 14 | Cement Corpn of India Ltd. | —1236 | +540 |
| 15 | The Fertilizer Corpn, of India Ltd. | —12938 | —4704 |
| 16 | Hindustan Antibiotics Ltd. | —811 | —481 |
| 17 | Hindustan Insecticides Ltd. | —396 | +247 |
| 18 | Hindustan Salts Ltd. | —17 | —9 |
| 19 | Indian Drugs & Pharmaceuticals Ltd. | —3241 | —2473 |
| 20 | Madras Fertilizers Ltd. | —760 | +606 |

| 1 | 2 | 3 | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 21 | Sambhar Salts Ltd. | —3 | included in Sl. No. 18 |
| 22 | Smith Stanistreet & Pharmaceuticals Ltd. | —135 | +5 |
| 23 | Hindustan Fertilizer Corpn. Ltd. | —7156 | —4145 |
| 24 | Indian Medicine Pharmaceutical Corpn. Ltd. | —5 | 0 |
| 25 | Maharashtra Antibiotics & Pharmaceuticals Ltd. | —50 | +22 |
| 26 | Goa Antibiotics & Pharmaceuticals Ltd. | —35 | N. A. |
| 27 | Punjab Maize Products Ltd. | —201 | N. A. |
| 28 | Bengal Chemicals & Pharmaceuticals Ltd. | —590 | —570 |
| 29 | Bengal Immunity Ltd. | —315 | —245 |
| | *Heavy Engineering* | | |
| 30 | Braithwaite & Co. Ltd. | —1214 | —471 |
| 31 | Heavy Engineering Corpn. Ltd. | —6941 | —2962 |
| 32 | Jessop & Co. Ltd. | —169 | +35 |
| 33 | Mining & Allied Machinery Corpn. Ltd. | —1230 | —337 |
| 34 | Bharat Process & Mechanical Engineers Ltd. | —312 | —207 |
| 35 | Weighbird (India) Ltd. | —85 | included in Sl. No. 34. |
| | *Medium & Light Engineering* | | |
| 36 | Bharat Pumps & Compressors Ltd. | —43 | +106 |
| 37 | Piecco Lawrie Ltd. | —420 | —504 |
| 38 | Bharat Brakes & Valves Ltd. | —252 | —132 |
| 39 | National Instruments Ltd. | —234 | —180 |
| 40 | Richardson & Cruddas (1972) Ltd. | — 698 | — 348 |
| 41 | Semi-Conductor Complex Ltd. | — 224 | — 69 |
| | *Transportation Equipment* | | |
| 42 | General Inland Water Tpt Corpn Ltd. | — 1446 | — 93 |
| 43 | Cochin Shipyard Ltd. | — 864 | — 791 |
| 44 | Garden Reach Shipbuilders & Engineers Ltd. | — 789 | — 1320 |
| 45 | Hindustan Shipyard Ltd. | — 3098 | — 959 |
| 46 | Mazagon Dock Ltd. | — 3898 | N.A. |
| 47 | Scooter India Ltd. | — 1642 | — 1315 |

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 48 | Cycle Corpn. of India Ltd. | —767 | —397 |
| 49 | National Bicycle Corpn. of India Ltd. | —496 | —274 |
| 50 | Hooghly Dock & Port Engineers Ltd. | —55 | +12 |
| | *Consumer Goods* | | |
| 51 | Hindustan Paper Corporation Ltd. | —2247 | —6211 |
| 52 | Nagaland Pulp & Paper Company Ltd. | —2307 | Included in Sl. No. 51. |
| 53 | Bharat Ophthalmic Glass Ltd. | —505 | —305 |
| 54 | The Mandya National Paper Mills Ltd. | —513 | included in Sl. No. 51 |
| 55 | Rehabilitation Industries Corpn, Ltd. | —637 | —631 |
| 56 | Tannery & Footwear Corpn. of India Ltd. | —929 | —847 |
| 57 | Hooghly Printing Company Ltd | —17 | N. A. |
| 58 | National Jute manufactures Company Ltd. | —4230 | —1977 |
| 59 | Hindustan Newsprint Ltd. | —100 | included in Sl. No. 51. |
| 60 | Tyre Corporation of India Ltd. | —736 | —423 |
| | *Agro-based Industries* | | |
| 61 | State Farms Corpn. of India Ltd. | —158 | +27 |
| 62 | Hoolungooree Tea Company Ltd. | —8 | —20 |
| 63 | The Mim Tea Company Ltd. | —2 | —1 |
| 64 | North Eastern National Agricultural Marketing Corpn Ltd | —12 | N. A. |
| | *Textiles* | | |
| 65 | NTC (Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka, Kerala and Mahe). Ltd. | —1111 | —1069 |
| 66 | NTC (Delhi, Punjab & Rajasthan) Ltd. | —893 | —879 |
| 67 | NTC (Gujarat) Ltd. | —1751 | - 1008 |
| 68 | NTC (Madhya Pradesh) Ltd. | —837 | - 845 |
| 69 | NTC (Maharashtra north) Ltd. | —1452 | - 1040 |
| 70 | NTC (South Maharashtra) Ltd. | —718 | —792 |
| 71 | NTC (Uttar Pradesh) Ltd. | —1271 | —2020 |
| 72 | NTC (West Bangal, Assam, Bihar and Orissa) Ltd | —2634 | —1724 |
| 73 | The British India Corpn. Ltd. | —160 | - 445 |

| 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 74 | The Elgin Mills Company Ltd. | - 1037 | - 1023 |
| 75 | Cawnpore Textiles Ltd. | - 123 | - 141 |
| | *Trading & Marketing Services* | | |
| 76 | Bharat Leather Corpn. Ltd. | [- 12 | +25 |
| 77 | The Cotton Corpn. of India Ltd. | —1069 | —1950 |
| 78 | The Handicrafts & Handlcoms Exports Corpn. of India Ltd. | —69 | +10 |
| 79 | *The Jute Corpn. of India Ltd.* | -2402 | —2490 |
| 80 | North Eastern Handicrafts & Handloom Development Corpn. Ltd. | —31 | —26 |
| 81 | Cardamom Trading Co[illegible]n Ltd. | —4 | N.A |
| | *Transportation Services* | | |
| 82 | The Mogul Line Ltd. | —:073 | * |
| 83 | Delhi Transport Corpn. | —17692 | —21947 |
| 84 | Vayudoot | - 78 | +70 |
| 85 | Helicopter Corpn. of India Ltd. | —4 | —697 |
| | *Contract & Construction Services* | | |
| 86 | Hindustan Prefab Ltd. | —87 | —65 |
| 87 | Indian Road Constn. Corpn. Ltd. | —1392 | - 412 |
| | *Industricl Development & Tech. Consultancy Services* | | |
| 88 | Engineering Projects (India) Ltd. | —3443 | - 1700 |
| | *Tourist Services* | | |
| 89 | Hotel Corpn. of India Ltd. | - 406 | - 189 |
| | *Section 25 Companies* | | |
| 90 | Artificial Limbs Manufacturing Corpn. of India | —190 | —175 |

*Since been merged with Shipping Corpn. of India Ltd.

(b) The Government have accepted in principle holding companies structure as a framework of organisational structure for public enterprises and in pursuance of this two holding companies—one with headquarters at Calcutta and another with headquarters at Allahabad—have already been set up. They are:—

(1) Bharat Yantra Nigam Ltd., with headquarters at Allahabad

(2) Bharat Bhari Udyog Nigam Ltd., with headquarters at Calcutta

The details of subsidiary companies under these holding companies are as follows:—

(1) *Bharat Bhari Udyog Nigam Ltd., Calcutta—*

(i) Bharat Brakes & Valves Ltd.
(ii) Bharat Process & Mechanical Engineers Ltd., and Weighbird (India) Ltd.
(iii) Lagan Jute Machinery Co. Ltd.
(iv) Bharat Wagon & Engineering Co. Ltd.
(v) Burn Standard Company Ltd.
(vi) Jessop & Company Ltd.
(vii) Braithwaite & Co. Ltd.
(viii) Braithwaite Burn, Jessop & Co. Ltd.

(2) *Bharat Yantra Nigam Ltd., Allahabad—*

(i) Bharat Heavy Plate & Vessels Ltd.
(ii) Bharat Pumps & Compressors Ltd.
(iii) Triveni Structurals Ltd.
(iv) Tungabhadra Steel Products Ltd.
(v) Richardson & Cruddas (1972) Ltd.
(vi) Bridge and Roof Co. (India) Ltd.

(c) The following are the performance targets fixed for the individual companies under the two holding companies.

(Rs. in crores)

| | Performance targets in terms of net profit (+)/loss (−) Amt. | |
|---|---|---|
| | 1986-87 | 1987-88 |
| 1. *Bharat Bhari Udyog Nigam Ltd., Calcutta* | | |
| Burn Standard Co. Ltd.. . . . . | (+)2·10 | (+)1·01 |
| Jessop & Co. Ltd.. . . . . | (+)0·35 | (+)0.80 |
| Braithwaite & Co. Ltd. . . . . | (+)4·71 | (+)5·80 |
| Bharat Wagon & Engg. Co. Ltd. . . . . | (+)1·12 | (+)1·23 |
| Bharat Process & Mechanical Engineers Ltd. . . . | (+)2·07 | (+)3·39 |
| Lagan Jute Machinery Co. Ltd. . . . . | (+)1·32 | (+)0·15 |
| 2. *Bharat Yantra Nigam Ltd., Allahabad.* | | |
| Bharat Pumps & Compressors Ltd.. . . . . | (+)2·06 | (+)1·12 |
| Bharat Heavy Plate & Vessels Ltd. . . . . | (+)7·97 | (+)8·30 |
| Bridge & Roof Company (India) Ltd. . . . . | (+)1·50 | (+)0.90 |
| Triveni Structurals Ltd. . . . . | (+)0·84 | (+)2·05 |
| Richardson & Cruddas (1972) Ltd. . . . . | (—)3·48 | (+)6·39 |
| Tungabhadra Steel Products Ltd. . . . . | (+)0·09 | (+)0·15 |

**श्री कैलाश पति मिश्र** : सभापति महोदय, सरकार ने जो विवरण प्रस्तुत किया है, 90 प्रतिशत अंडरटेकिंग्ज में से जो अगला टार्गेट है परफार्मेंस का उसमें दिखाया गया है कि कुछ प्राफिट में जायेंगे और बाकी सब घाटे में जायेंगे। 16 अक्तूबर को राज्य मंत्री महोदय का एक आर्टिकल "इंडियां टुडे" में छपा है, हैडिंग है—

If smaller companies are put under bigger ones, the Government will be freed of responsibility of financing them.

साथ ही बारह पब्लिक अंडरटेकिंग्ज को दो बड़ी संस्थाओं को सौंप देने का विवरण भी इसमें प्रस्तुत किया गया है।

मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि इस सरकार को जब यह समझ में आया कि सारे पब्लिक अंडरटेकिंग्ज घाटे में चल रहे हैं, उसके बाद से सब के बारे में निर्णय करने के लिए कोई ठोस कदम उठाये हैं या कोई नीति बनाई है क्या ?

दूसरे यह जो दो इंडिविजुअल कम्पनीज को बारह अभी तक सौंप दी गई हैं, क्या इसी प्रकार नब्बे की नब्बे पब्लिक अंडरटेकिंग्ज को भी किसी न किसी इंडिविजुअल कम्पनी को सौंप देने की नीति सरकार ने स्वीकार कर ली है क्या ?

**प्रो० के० के० तिवारी** : सभापति महोदय, प्रश्न बहुत साफ है। जैसा कि प्रश्न आपने देखा होगा, सम्मानित सदस्य के मन में कुछ भ्रम है। कई तरह के प्रश्न पूछे हैं। यह जाहिर है कि जिन कम्पनियों में घाटा हुआ है, उन कम्पनियों का जिक्र यहां किया गया है, लेकिन कई कम्पनियों को एक खास कम्पनी को हैंड ओवर करने या उनको सौंपने के प्रश्न में कनफ्यूजन हुआ है। आपने बात की है मर्जर की और सब्सिडियरी स्टेटस की, सरकार ने इंजीनियरिंग सैक्टर की कंपनीज का अध्ययन करवाया और जो निर्णय लिया सरकार ने पब्लिक सैक्टर में जहां घाटे होते थे, जहां-जहां प्रशासनिक प्रश्न थे उनको सुधारने के लिए एक सब्सिडियरी कंपनी और होल्डिंग कंपनी कंसेप्ट का कमेटी ने सुझाव दिया और वह प्रश्न मर्जर का नहीं है, क्रंपनी मर्ज नहीं की गई, मर्जर का मतलब दूसरा होता है और होल्डिंग कंपनी कंसेप्ट दूसरा होता है, इसलिए सरकार ने उस विशेषज्ञ समिति की रिपोर्ट के अनुसार दो होल्डिंग कंपनीज स्थापित की हैं जो मुख्य करके इंजीनियरिंग से सेक्टर के लिए हैं और दोनों ने काम करना शुरू कर दिया है।

**श्री कैलाश पति मिश्र** : सभापति महोदय, जहां एक ओर कहा गया है कि ब्यूरोक्रेट्स की इंटरफीयरेंस नहीं रहेगी और दूसरी ओर होल्डिंग कंपनी के नाम पर भारत भारी उद्योग निगम लि० तथा भारत यंत्र निगम लि० के अंतर्गत 12 पब्लिक अण्डरटेकिंग्ज को कर दिया गया है, मैं यह प्रश्न पूछना चाहता हूं कि इन दोनों धारक कंपनियों के प्रबन्धन में भारत सरकार का कितना प्रभाव है और कितना उसका अधिकार है ?

**प्रो० के० के० तिवारी** : सभापति महोदय, जो आपकी चिंता है कि ब्यरोक्रेसी का इंटरफीयरेंस होता है, खास करके उसी लिए कि सरकार का उसमें कोई भी हस्तक्षेप न हो, नौकरशाही का कोई उसमें हस्तक्षेप न हो, इस लिए ही होल्डिंग कंपनी कंसेप्ट निकाला गया और जितनी उसकी सब्सिडियरीज हैं सरकार का उन से अब कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं रहेगा, सरकार सम्बन्ध रखेगी सिर्फ उन होल्डिंग कंपनीज से और जो एक कंपनी उसकी अम्ब्रेला कंपनी एपेक्स, बाड़ी होगी और बाकी जो उसकी सब्सिडियरीज कंपनीज होंगी वे सीधे होल्डिंग कंपनी के प्रति जिम्मेवार होंगी। इसलिए सरकार का जो तथाकथित हस्तक्षेप था वह बहुत कम हो गया है। इसलिए अब सरकार का उसमें इंटरफीयरेंस होने का कोई सवाल ही नहीं है। वह अपना काम होल्डिंग कंपनी के लेवल पर होल्डिंग कंपनी ही करेगी और जो उसकी सब्सिडियरीज है वे अपने कामों के लिए और अपने प्रशासनिक कामों के लिए भी

वे सभी होल्डिंग कंपनी के प्रति ही जिम्मेवार होंगी ।

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Jagesh Desai.

**श्री कैलाश पति मिश्र** : प्रबन्धन पर सरकार का अधिकार है या नहीं, इसका उत्तर अभी नहीं मिला ।

MR. CHAIRMAN: It has been answered in a way. Yes, Mr. Jagesh Desai.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: Sir, I would like to draw the attention of the honourable Minister to the last page of the statement. Sir, the thrust of the Government is that there should be efficiency in the public sector and through efficiency losses should be reduced and profits should be enhanced. But I am surprised to find from the statement that in the case of 12 companies the position is such that as compared to 1986-87, in six companies the target of loss has been increased and in three companies the targets of profits are being reduced. Generally, Sir, the targets are always on the side of increase except under some special circumstances. I would like to know from the honourable Minister why in the case of these six companies the target of loss has been increased. For example in the case of Richardson & Cruddas, the loss was Rs. 3.48 crores in 1986-87 and now the target has been increased to Rs. 6.39 crores. Similarly, in the case of Braithwaite & Co. Ltd. also, the loss in 1986-87 was Rs. 4.71 crores while the target has been increased to Rs. 5.80 crores. And, Sir, in the case of two companies, while profits were being earned previously, the target has been reduced now. I would like to know the reason for these things and also how these targets are fixed. I am saying this because this will result in complacency and efficiency will be reduced. I would like to know from the honourable Minister what action the Government is going to take in this regard.

PROF. K. K. TEWARY: Sir, the Government has taken all these factors into account and if the overall performance of the public sector in terms of net profits is taken into account, there has been an improvement. It is not a fact that the public sector, across the board, has been making losses.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: I have not said like that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will give you an opportunity, Mr. Desai, if the Minister does not reply to your question fully.

PROF. K. K. TEWARY: There are companies which have made losses during 1985-86 and there are companies which have been making losses for 5 years or 4 years; we do not deny that. But in recent years, specially last two years, Government sas taken all possible steps to improve the functioning, overall efficiency, of the public sector, and many steps have been taken naturally. But the problem is so gigantic and it will take time. The losses which are visible have taken place in certain sector—for example, the steel sector, the coal sector and mineral and metals. So these major sectors have made losses. But, Sir, in 1986-87, again, the same sectors have shown a remarkable improvement. Those figures have also been given. Therefore, I think we should not go only by certain companies whose performance has not been up to our level of satisfaction. Sir, about the two companies mentioned by the hon. Member, I can inform him that the targets set for 1986-87 were conditional, and they are provisional figures, because these companies were expecting that their interest burden will mount in 1986-87. So that component, liability to pay higher interest on loans taken by the companies and also since 1985-86 and 1986-87 there have been negotiations going on for new wage settlements—these liabilities have also been included in the figures. Therefore, the targets have been shown a little lower than the earlier years.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Jagesh Desai.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: Mr. Chairman, Sir, as regards the working of the public sector there is no doubt that after the Prime Minister gave personal attention the efficiency increased and many companies which were making losses are making profits now. But my question is quite different. What I want to say, Sir,

is that in the cases of companies which earned profits in 1986-87 the targets for 1987-88 have been at a lesser level.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. The question is why the targets for the next year were reduced.

PROF. K. K. TEWARY: Sir, the targets are shown in terms of performance. As I said, these companies have lots of problems. Both the companies mentioned here and some others who have scaled down the performance targets are all taken-over units. They have myraids of problems in terms of technology, in terms of old machinery, additional burden of interest payment during 1986-87, and then, negotiations are on for wage settlements. These have all to be borne by the companies. Therefore, very realistic targets have been set, keeping all these factors into account.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Dr. Kaldate.

डा० वसंत कालदाते : सभापति महोदय, सार्वजनिक उपक्रमों को जो भी घाटा आता है इसके जो कुछ कारण हैं उनमें से एक कारण यह भी है कि this has become an old boys' club. कहीं कई ऐसे सरकारी अधिकारी जिनको कि इन उद्यमी क्षेत्रों का अनुभव नहीं होता जो लोन सर्विसेज पर वहां चले जाते हैं और उनको एडीशनल भत्ता भी मिलता है, लेकिन जो उस उपक्रम के बारे में जानकारी चाहिये रा-मैटीरियल से लेकर फिनिश प्रोडक्टस की मार्केटिंग की उसकी जानकारी भी न होने के कारण भी लासेज हो जाते हैं, तो क्या इस दृष्टि से सरकार ने कभी देखा है कि क्या इनके लासेज का एक यह भी कारण हैं कि यह ओल्ड ब्वायज क्लब हो गया है ? इसलिये यह ओल्ड ब्वायज क्लब डिजाल्व करके सही मायने में इसकी जानकारी रखने वाले लोगों को वहां रखा जायेगा इस दृष्टि से सरकार कोई प्रयास करेगी ?

प्रो० के० के० तिवारी : सभापति महोदय, सम्मानित सदस्य को मैं यह सूचना देना चाहूंगा कि यह नये और पुराने लोगों का क्लब नहीं है बल्कि यह राष्ट्र को आगे ले जाने, राष्ट्र की आर्थिक स्थिति को आत्मनिर्भर करने और स्वावलम्बी करने का एक संकल्प है। दर्शन है और उसके तहत इस संस्था को स्थापित किया गया है और इसमें इनकी भूमिका बड़ी ऐतिहासिक रही है अगर हम देश के विकास की गति को देखें और इन सारी बातों पर विचार करें।

यह भी मैं सूचना आपको देना चाहूंगा कि जो यह ओल्ड ब्वायज क्लब की चर्चा आप कर रहे हैं, शायद आपका संकेत है उन अधिकारियों से जो बाहर के हैं या नौकरशाही में हैं, आई०ए०एस० की चर्चा शायद हुआ करती है, उनको हम पब्लिक सक्टर में नहीं रखते। अब किसी भी अधिकारी को पब्लिक सेक्टर के लिये चुनाव करना होता है और त्यागपत्र देकर एक्जामिनेशन सीक करना होता है। इसलिये प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने इस पर ध्यान दिया और सरकार ने तय किया कि इसमें सिर्फ टैक्नोक्रटस को ही हम रखेंगे। उसके लिये टार्गेट्स फिक्स करें और एम०ओ०यू० तय करेंगे। इसलिये हमारा कमिटमेंट है कि हम इसको इंप्रूव करें और उसके रीजल्ट्स सामने आने लगे हैं।

SHRI BIR BHADRA PRATAP SINGH: Sir, our endeavour is to cut down wasteful expenditure or at least to reduce losses that are incurred by he public sector undertakings. In fact, what we find is that in similar cases there are two or three public sector undertakings operating in the same city. For instance, there is N.T.C. in Kanpur. There is also B.I.C. in Kanpur. Why can't you merge similar types of organisations which are increasing our losses?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You don't want competition.

SHRI BIR BHADRA PRATAP SINGH: I want to know why they should not cut down this wasteful expenditure which is an unnecessary burden on the exchequer, by merging such units. The Prime Minister himself has said that such units should be merged.

PROF. K. K. TEWARY: Sir, the confusion persists. Merger is not the same thing as the concept of a holding company.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, he says: "Why don't you merge'?

PROF. K. K. TEWARY: We have not decided about merging the companies. We have thought about organisational framework or structural framework. I will come to the concept of holding companies. To begin with, the holding companies have started functioning in the engineering sector and it is just an experiment. As and when necessity for more holding companies arises, the Government will definitely look into it. I must make it clear that the holding company is not a panacea for all diseases. It is just an experiment. So far as merger is concerned, we have not thought of merger. If there is more tahn one company in the same production line, then we have a very healthy competition. We have not gone in for merger. We have gone in for holding companies because of better coordination and better administrative set up.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: Sir, the Minister says that the holding companies will be able to reduce the losses. I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to the fact that there are companies which are holding companies such as Coal India Limied. If that is the case, I would like to ask the hon. Minister as to why the performance targets have been fixed lower in the case of two companies and in the case of other two, they have made it plus. I would like to know from the hon. Minister what are the factors which are responsible for such poor performance. How does he explain that some categories of industries, even though they are under the category of holding companies, are not doing well?

PROF. K. K. TEWARY: I would like to know from the hon. Member whether he is addressing Coal Ministry or my Ministry of Public Enterprises.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: I am talking about the industries which are mentioned in the question.

PROF. K. K. TEWARY: It all depends on the internal problems of the company concerned. Some companies are better placed in terms of technology.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The time is over. Question Hour is over.

---

## WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

### Public sector companies incurring losses

*161. SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Will the Minister of INDUSTRY be pleased to state:

(a) whether any public sector companies under his Ministry have been closed down due to heavy losses; and

(b) if so, what are the names of such companies and the quantum of losses incurred by them so far?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC ENTERPRISES IN THE MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY (PROF. K. K. TEWARY): (a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

### Expert Committee on Essential Drugs

*165. SHRIMATI SUDHA VIJAY JOSHI:

SHRI N. RAJANGAM:

Will the Minister of INDUSTRY be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Government have set up an expert Committee to determine the list of essential drugs;

(b) if so, what are the names of its members and the terms of reference made to the Committee; and

(c) by when it is likely to submit its report?

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRY (SHRI J. VENGALA RAO): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The names of the Members of the Committee constituted to identify drugs to be included in the proposed category II as partially modified on 2nd March, 1987 are given in the attached statement (*See* below). The Committee's task is to draw up a list of essential drugs which would form Category II.

(c) The Committee shall submit its report within two months.